



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Application of PER JACOBSEN**

**Docket No.: IPB.021**

**Serial No.: 10/563,422**

**Art Unit: 3633**

**Filed: January 5, 2006**

**Examiner: Dinesh K. Vesra**

**For: WINDOW WITH SCREENING ARRANGEMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE**

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action dated June 2, 2009, the applicant has the following remarks:

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of claim 23 under 35 USC 112 on the ground of indefiniteness. However, he repeats the rejections of the claims on the basis of prior art, and adds new claim 36 to the rejection of claims under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over the Persson reference in view of the MacDonald reference. He also objects to the Amendment filed in April 2009 on the ground that “self-releasable” constitutes new matter.

“Self-releasable” is not new matter. Although the term “self-releasable” was not previously used, the feature of “self-releasable” was described, for example, in Paragraph [0049] of the application as follows: “As schematically shown, the end of the screening element 23 is connected to the frame bottom member 4 by an engagement means 26, such as any kind of